UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,034	12/28/2001	Peter Gassner	021756-017130US	2584

51206 7590 10/10/2007

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
VU, TUAN A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/041,034	GASSNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *4-12,15-17,19-31,38-48,60-64 and 71-74* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *4-12,15-17,19-31,38-48,60-64 and 71-74* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 8/01/07.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 4-8, 12, 15-17, 19-21, 29-31, 38, 41, 45, 60, 62, 71 have been amended, and claims 13-14, 18, 32-37, 49-59, 65-70, 75-77 canceled. Claims 4-12, 15-17, 19-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74 are pending in the office action.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 15, 21, 29, 38, 41, 45, 60, 71 are objected to because of the following informalities: "user interaction ...is able to be used' (cl. 15, cl. 21, cl. 29 -last para); "the functionality ... is able to be used" (cl. 38, cl. 45, cl. 60, cl. 71, last para); "customizable property ... able to be used" (cl. 41, last para) amount to improper usage of the 'able to' concept, because an 'interaction' is not a functional entity – in light of the Disclosure - that contains a integral ability to do something, nor is a 'functionality' disclosed as being customized and thereby possessing a definite *ability as to be used by* an interface; nor does a 'property' contain any functional ability to be used so.

3. Claim 4 is objected to for what appears to be typographical inconsistency in reciting 'personalization *system* being further...' (3rd paragraph) in a context described as including just 'personalization server', and 'personalization engine'.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 5, 7, 21, 60, 65, 71 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4, 44, 66, 72, and 81 of copending Application No. 10,041,015 (hereinafter '015), in view of Beauchamp et al., USPN: 6,621,505.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following observations.

Following are but a few examples as to how the certain claims from the instant invention and from the above copending application are conflicting with each other.

As per instant claim 5, '015 claim 4 (or claim 44) recites an internet application system with user interface and web server, a customizable interaction model (i.e. a customizable interaction model being the view-all-command), a metadata as in a repository for storing data characterizing the model (data stored in a repository, data defining a property of an element of the view all command); separately configurable interaction models (i.e. more than one of the plurality of application user interfaces), plurality of application user interfaces separately configurable models (i.e. more than one generations of user interface are generated and configured with said property), and web server to deliver generated markup language for the application interface of the user. 'But '015 claim 4 does not recite *personalization engine* or

user profile interface delivered by a personalization server, the personalization to modify personalization data characterizing the customizable interaction model for use with plurality of application user interfaces, such *customizable interaction model* providing customizable interaction characterized by said personalization of the user independent of the type of application. The concept of personalization is integral to the concept of customization by a user as implicated in '015 claim 4 (e.g. customize ... a view all command in the ...user interface) such that *the personalization data providing customizable interaction and personalization data characterizing a interaction model for a plurality of user interfaces* limitation will be treated as the user's modifying of data act within a user interface; and since this is a framework for a plurality of applications based on '015 recording of configuration modeled for all GUI command in a meta-database, the server providing of configuration of data needed to the personalization concept would have been but an obvious feature. Analogous to '015 framework, Beauchamp teaches an activity including a plurality of screens being customized by client session and specific users using personal role and identity (e.g. col. 6, lines 45-48; *registered* col. 24 lines 59-64; col. 21, lines 50-56; *access control* -col. 23, lines 8-19; col. 6, lines 45-48; *registered* col. 24 lines 59-64). Based on the context in which plurality of interfaces is generated with state per instances thereof being preserved to be linked with one another ('015 preserving a state), it would have been obvious that the plurality of interfaces being generated for a view-all-command be allocated with means of verifying by Beauchamp (personalization engine or profile interface) such that specific linking of screens per session of one user would enable the customizing environment for a specific user (as in modifying functionality of elements on the customizable view or modeling interface) be verified before repository assets or application data can be

distributed via profile resources server for such user's access and usage, i.e. 'allowing users to modify the functionality of elements in the interaction model for that user'.

As per instant claims 7, 21, '015 claim 4, or 44 does not recite communication timing but this timing is disclosed in Beauchamp (e.g. *one at a time* – col. 9, lines 31-46). It would have been obvious to add this timing step to '015 claim 5 context so that the Beauchamp's teaching in view of the user's customizing context in the instant claims based on the communication therein, would alleviate network usage or bandwidth by determining a correct time by which further data would need to be downloaded to a user-specific environment.

As per instant claims 60, 65, 71, '015 claims 66, 72, and 81 also recite generating HTML to incorporate into a model after using metadata in a page definition from a server via a client request.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 4-12, 15-17, 19-27, 29-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beauchamp et al., USPN: 6,621,505 (hereinafter Beauchamp).

As per claim 4, Beauchamp discloses a system having for generating application user interfaces having a customized user interaction, comprising:

a personalization server system including a personalization engine and operable to deliver a user profile interface to a user, the personalization system being further operable to allow the user to modify personalization data for that user through the user profile interface (e.g. col. 21, lines 50-56; access control --col. 23, lines 8-19 – Note: back end user being administered via enterprise control processes and server-based external resources – see col. 21, lines 46-51 -- related to user-specific business object access/use **reads on** personal data being profiled for such access eligibility),

the personalization data characterizing a customizable interaction model (e.g. col. 23, line 66 to col. 24, line 56; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 62 – Note: Activity screen enabling customizing a process at a universal client framework - col. 4, line 13-46 – reads on user modifying a customizable process via GUI lay-out of object and screens integral to a **model**ing of such business process – see Fig. 3-5; Fig. 10) for use with a plurality of application user interfaces (e.g. business oriented activities or processes – see reuse - col. 4, line 13-46 – Note: reuse of class, objects or repository of metadata reads on extensible to a plurality of user application interfaces);

an Internet application server operable to execute a selected Internet application of the plurality of Internet applications including a selected application user interface (e.g. col. 19, lines 30-34; Fig. 6), the Internet application server including a user interface generator operable to generate markup language (e.g. XML – Web server 210, Fig. 8; col. 5, lines 48-58) including the selected application user interface using metadata for the selected application user interface (e.g. metadata manager 238, Context manager 242, User process 232, Fig. 8), the customizable interaction model, and the personalization data for the user, in order to include (e.g. Fig. 8) the

customized interaction (e.g. single business process interface … common user interface - col. 9, lines 8-30) with the selected application user interface;

a data repository including a data record for storing the personalization data (e.g. col. 21, lines 50-56; access control - col. 23, lines 8-19; *databases ... user log-ins* - col. 17, lines 61-67), the data record being accessible using the metadata; and

a web server operable to deliver the generated markup language (e.g. *passed back to the universal client* – col. 20, lines 52-61) for the selected application interface to a client device for the user,

wherein the customizable interaction model is usable by each plurality of Internet applications to provide the customizable interaction (e.g. col. 9, lines 8-30) characterized by the personalization of the user (see col. 18, lines 49-67; col. 19, lines 31-45) independent of the type of application user interface used by that Internet application.

As per claim 5, Beauchamp discloses wherein the plurality of application user interfaces utilizes separately (for each user that is logged onto the system – col. 17, lines 51-56) configurable interaction models.

As per claim 6, Beauchamp discloses wherein timing of communication between the client device and the web server is responsive to (e.g. *one at a time* – col. 9, lines 31-46; Fig. 14A-B; col. 17 lines 51-67; col. 18, lines 38-67; Fig. 7) the customizable interaction model.

As per claim 7, Beauchamp discloses a system for developing an Internet application including an application user interface with a customizable user interaction, the system comprising:

an application development server operable to allow an integrated development environment configured for a developer to specify a user interface element (e.g. single business process interface ... common user interface - col. 9, lines 8-30) to be included in the application user interface, the user interface element being associated with a user customizable interaction model (Note: Activity screen enabling customizing a process at a universal client framework - col. 4, line 13-46 – reads on user modifying a customizable process via GUI lay-out of object and screens integral to a **model**ing of such business process – see Fig. 10; Fig. 3-5),

the user customizable interaction model allowing each user of the application user interface to modify functionality of the user interface element (e.g. col. 23, line 66 to col. 24, line 56; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 62), the user customizable interaction model operable to be used with any application user interface independent of the type of interface (e.g. col. 18, lines 49-67; col. 19, lines 31-45; col. 4, line 13-46 – Note: reuse of class, objects or repository of metadata reads on extensible to a plurality of user application interfaces);

an application designer configured to produce metadata (e.g. Fig. 3, 5; universal client – Fig. 2) to characterize the user customizable interaction model (e.g. XML – Web server 210, Fig. 8; col. 5, lines 48-58);

a personalization server including a personalization engine and operable to deliver a user profile interface to a user, the personalization system being further operable to allow the user to modify personalization data for that user through the user profile interface, the personalization data characterizing the customizable interaction model for use with the Internet application and any other application using that customizable interaction model (refer to claim 4); and

a data repository including a user modifiable data record configured to store the personalization data (e.g. e.g. col. 21, lines 50-56; access control - col. 23, lines 8-19; *databases ... user log-ins* - col. 17, lines 61-67) characterizing user customizable interaction model.

As per claim 8, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application development server integrated development environment is further configured to specify display of an interaction model control command (e.g. Fig. 10; Fig. 3-5) in the application user interface, the interaction model control command being configured for a user to change (e.g. col. 23, line 66 to col. 24, line 56; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 62; Fig. 9-10) the user customizable interaction model.

As per claim 9, Beauchamp discloses deferred and immediate modes (e.g. step 418 – *waits* Fig. 14A; step 406, Fig. 14A – Note: immediate login feedback and waits for user reads on immediate and deferred modes, respectively).

As per claim 10, Beauchamp discloses that the user customizable interaction model is configurable according to the identity of a user or the identity of the client (e.g. *User, Role* - step 426, Fig. 14A)

As per claims 11-12, Beauchamp discloses that a state of the user customizable interaction model is further configurable to persist (e.g. *reused* – col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 18, lines 9-21; *state of the active process* - col. 24, lines 30-47) between uses of the application user interface; and wherein the user modifiable data record is further user modifiable using a configuration system (*reused* – col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 22, lines 1-45; Fig. 10, Fig. 13).

As per claim 15, Beauchamp discloses a system for generating a user interface with customized user interaction, comprising:

an Internet application server operable to support an Internet application (e.g. col. 19, lines 30-34; Fig. 6);

an application user interface generator operable to generate a user interface for the Internet application for display on a client (e.g. Fig. 3-5), the user interface being generated using a customizable interaction model and personalization data for a user allowing the user to modify of a user interaction with the user interface (e.g. col. 23, line 66 to col. 24, line 56; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 62 – Note: user interface activity and dynamic user actions reads on modifying a user interaction by user);

metadata characterizing the customizable interaction model (Fig. 3, 5; universal client – Fig. 2; col. 22, lines 1-45); and a data repository including a data record for characterizing the customizable interaction model, the data record being user modifiable and being accessible using the metadata (e.g. col. 22, lines 1-45; XML – Web server 210, Fig. 8; col. 5, lines 48-58),

wherein the customizable interaction model is operable to be used to generate a respective application user interface for each of a plurality of additional applications, whereby the user interaction customized by the user is able to be used with the respective application user interface independent of a type of the application user interface (e.g. col. 9, lines 8-30; col. 18, lines 49-67; col. 19, lines 31-45).

As per claim 16, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface is configured for display on the client using standard web browser protocols (e.g. col. 6, lines 16-48).

As per claim 17, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface is further configured for display on the client using features of a web browser (e.g. col. 15, line 50 to col. 16, line 34), the features not requiring a browser add-on, plug-in, or extension.

As per claims 19-20, Beauchamp discloses configuration system configured to modify the data record (e.g. col. 4, lines 23-46; Fig. 3-5 – Note: navigation by user from screens to have process data populated into a standard screens reads on modifying a record); wherein the configuration system is included in the internet application (e.g. *HTML page 36* –Applications, Fig. 2).

As per claim 21, Beauchamp discloses a Internet application system having processor readable storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions on a computer system, comprising:

a user interface generator configured to generate an application user interface (Fig. 3-5; col. 15, line 50 to col. 16, line 34), the application user interface being compatible with a standard web browser (e.g. web server – Fig. 8) and being generated in response to a request from a user, the user interface generator utilizing a user customizable interaction model allowing each user of the application user interface to modify user interaction with the application user interface (e.g. col. 23, line 66 to col. 24, line 56; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 62 – Note: user interface activity and dynamic user actions reads on modifying a user interaction by user);
a web application server configured to deliver the generated application user interface to the client; and

an Internet application accessible to the user through the generated application user interface (e.g. Fig. 8-9),

wherein the customizable interaction model is operable to be used to generate a respective application user interface for each of a plurality of additional applications, whereby the user interaction customized by the user is able to be used with the respective application user interface, independent of a type of the application user interface (refer to claims 4 and 15), and delivered to the client.

As per claim 22, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user interface generator is further configured to use metadata (e.g. *metadata* - col. 5, lines 32-58; col. 6, lines 58-62) to characterize the user customizable interaction model.

As per claim 23, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user customizable interaction model is specific to a user interface element (Fig. 14A; User/Role – step 456 –Fig. 14B; *Customer specific* - Fig. 16) included in the application user interface.

As per claim 24, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user interface generator is customizable interaction model (e.g. Fig. 3-5; step 414, Fig. 14A).

As per claims 25-27, refer to corresponding rejections as set forth in claims 12, 10, and 9 respectively.

As per claim 29, Beauchamp discloses a computer program product embedded therein for executing instructions on a computer system embedded in a computer readable medium for generating a customizable application user interface, comprising program code for:

generating an application user interface (e.g. Fig. 3-5) using a customizable interaction model (e.g. Fig. 10), the application user interface configured for delivery to a client and to operate as an interface (e.g. single business process interface … common user interface - col. 9, lines 8-30) between a user and the computer program;

allowing the user to modify personalization data for the user characterizing the customizable interaction model for use with the application user interface and any other application interface using that customizable interaction model (e.g. col. 23, line 66 to col. 24, line 56; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 62);

storing a user modifiable data record stored in a location physically remote from the client, the data record characterizing the customizable interaction model including the user-modified functionality (e.g. col. 21, lines 50-56; access control - col. 23, lines 8-19; *databases ... user log-ins* - col. 17, lines 61-67); and

storing metadata (e.g. col. 22, lines 1-45; XML – Web server 210, Fig. 8; col. 5, lines 48-58) configurable for use by the user interface generator to access the user modifiable data record;

wherein the customizable interaction model is operable to be used to generate a respective application user interface for each of a plurality of additional applications, whereby the user interaction customized by the user is able to be used with the respective application user interface, independent of a type of the application user interface, and delivered to the client (refer to claim 4 and 15 for cited portions correspondingly).

As per claims 30-31, refer to corresponding rejections as set forth in claims 9-10, respectively.

As per claim 38, Beauchamp discloses a method of developing an application user interface associated with an Internet application, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a user customizable interaction model characterized by a data record (e.g. Fig. 14A), the data record being stored in a data repository (e.g. Fig. 10-11) and being user modifiable allowing a user to modify functionality of at least one user interface element in the

application user interface, the data repository being physically remote from a client used to display the application user interface (Fig. 7-9; col. 22, lines 1-45; XML – Web server 210, Fig. 8; col. 5, lines 48-58);

generating the application user interface for the user using including the user customizable interaction model (e.g. Fig. 10) and the data record (e.g. single business process interface … common user interface - col. 9, lines 8-30; Fig. 3-5);

generating metadata characterizing the user customizable interaction model including the user-modified functionality, the metadata including a reference to the data record (e.g. XML – Web server 210, Fig. 8; col. 5, lines 48-58); and

storing the metadata in association with the Internet application (e.g. Fig. 8), the Internet application being configured for access (e.g. Fig. 13) using the application user interface,

wherein the user customizable interaction model is operable to be used to generate a respective application user interface for each of a plurality of additional applications, whereby the functionality customized by the user is able to be used with the respective application user interface, independent of a type of the application user interface (refer to claim 4 and 15 for cited portions correspondingly).

As per claim 39, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface includes an interaction model control command (e.g. Fig. 3-5, Fig. 14A).

As per claim 40, Beauchamp discloses determining when communication occurs between the client and the internet application responsive to the interaction model (e.g. step 408, Fig 14A; steps 440 through steps 446, 452, 466, 472, 478, Fig. 14B).

As per claim 41, Beauchamp discloses a method of generating an application user interface, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata (e.g. Fig. 8, *metadata* - Fig. 13 – Note: processing a XML content defined in such format by a service – see Fig. 9, 12 -- to correspond to a user process – see Fig. 3-5; Fig. 14 -- reads on accessing of such XML page respective to a user request) associated with a customizable property of a interaction model;

accessing a data record using the metadata, the data record being stored in a data repository (e.g. Fig. 13 and col. 24) and being user modifiable allowing a user to modify the customizable property (e.g. Fig. 10; Fig. 3-5; Fig. 15 Note: reusable objects from repository for support of Universal client layout of screens and properties of a business process modeling reads on property from the reusable metadata – see Fig. 11-12), the data repository being physically remote from a client used to display the application user interface (see Fig. 11-12);

determining a value characterizing the customizable property (col. 6, line 52-65; Fig 14A-B; col. 21, lines 40-67, Fig. 6) using the data record;

generating markup-language responsive to the determined value (see Fig. 13 and col. 24; Fig. 14A-B); and including the generated markup-language (*passed back to the universal client* – col. 20, lines 52-61; Figs. 14) in the application user interface, the application user interface being an interface to an Internet application,

wherein the user interaction model is operable to be used to generate a respective application user interface for each of a plurality of additional applications, whereby the customizable property customized by the user is able to be used with the respective application user interface, independent of a type of the application user interface (re claim 4 or 15).

As per claims 42 and 44, refer to claim 13, and 10, respectively.

As per claim 43, Beauchamp discloses wherein the customized property includes a deferred mode (step 418 – *waits* Fig. 14A).

As per claim 45, Beauchamp discloses a method of personalizing a user customizable interaction model to be used with multiple application user interfaces, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a user customizable interaction model associated with a data record and specifying interaction functionality to be associated with each application user interface, the data record being configurable by a user for characterizing the user customizable interaction model, the user customizable interaction model including a plurality of interaction modes;

generating at least one application user interface using including the user customizable interaction model (refer to claim 38);

generating metadata characterizing the user customizable interaction model, the metadata including a reference to the data record (refer to claim 38); and

storing the metadata in association with an application, the application being configured for access using the application user interface (refer to claim 38)

wherein the user interaction model is operable to be used to generate a respective application user interface for each of a plurality of applications, whereby the interaction functionality specified by the user customizable interaction model is able to be used with the respective application user interface, independent of a type of the application user interface (refer to claim 4 or 15).

As per claims 46-47, refer to claims 36 and 9, respectively.

As per claim 48, Beauchamp discloses wherein a customizable state of the user customizable interaction model is configurable to persist between uses of the HTML based application user interface (*reused* – col. 4, lines 31-46).

As per claim 60, Beauchamp discloses a computer-implemented method of executing an Internet application, comprising the steps of:

receiving a request from a user for an application user interface from a client (e.g. Fig. 2, 7-8), the application user interface including a user interface element;

accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata characterizing the application user interface (re claim 41);

retrieving a value characterizing a customizable interaction model associated with the user interface using the metadata, the value being stored in a data repository physically remote from the client, the value further being specified by the user in order to modify interaction functionality of the application user interface (re claim 41);

generating HTML responsive to the retrieved value; including the generated HTML in the application user interface; and delivering the application user interface to the client, the application user interface being an interface between a user and the Internet application (refer to XML passing to a browser interface in claim 41),

wherein the customizable interaction model is further associated with additional applications whereby the modified interaction functionality is able to be included in a respective application user interface for each additional application independent of a type of interface being generated (refer to claim 4 or 15).

As per claims 61, 63, refer to claim 27, 54, respectively.

As per claims 62, 64, refer to the rationale addressing personalization of claims 10, 13.

As per claim 71, Beauchamp discloses a computer implemented method of generating an application user interface configured for delivery from a server to a client, comprising the steps of:

receiving, at the server, a request for the application user interface from a user at the client; identifying the user requesting the application user interface, the application user interface being associated with including a user customizable interaction model (re claim 60);

accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata and characterizing the application user interface (re claim 41);

retrieving, using the metadata and the identity of the user, a value for characterizing the user customizable interaction model, the value being selected by the requestor in order to modify interaction functionality of the application user interface, the value being stored in a data repository (re claim 41);

generating HTML incorporating the interaction model using the value (re claim 41);

including the generated HTML in the application user interface; and delivering the application user interface from the server to the client (re claim 41),

wherein the customizable interaction model is further associated with additional applications whereby the modified interaction functionality is able to be included in a respective application user interface for each additional application independent of a type of interface being generated (re claim 41).

As per claims 72-74, refer to the corresponding rejections addressing claims 6, 9, and 39, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp et al., USPN: 6,621,505 as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Helgeson et al. USPN: 6,643,652 (hereinafter Helgeson).

As per claim 28, Beauchamp does not disclose a client wireless system; but at the time the invention was made, the use of browser markup language as carrier of specification data, -- such as XML -- has been used to communicate with devices in all type of networks wherein wireless protocol for wireless portable or embedded processing units was a known and evolving methodology. In a method to extend the browser functionality similar to Beauchamp creating of browser metadata (Fig. 6), Helgeson discloses a client machine being a wireless device (cellular phone 411, Fig. 4). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the client system of Beauchamp wireless devices as taught by Helgeson because rendering of client interface environment using metadata specified via a carrier like XML metadata would enable those wireless system to obtain support from server providers without a sustained link with such service; and thus by means of wireless protocol as taught above XML-formatted specification would provide resource-efficient support for dynamic for a as-needed basis application specification in order to render browser

functionality as purported by Beauchamp, in view of the known concept that wireless devices entail restricted storage resources.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 8/1/07 have been fully considered but they are mostly moot in view of the changes to the claims or not persuasive. Following are the Examiner's observation in regard thereto.

Double Patenting Rejection:

(A) Applicants' view that '015 cannot render obvious the interaction model applicable to any application UI in light of Beauchamp (Appl. Rmrks pg. 15). The interpretation from the language of claim 4 has been clarified in the rejection, and based thereupon, a rationale as to why some teaching derived from claim 4's language has been interpreted as mere obvious variant to '015 in view of Beauchamp. The rationale for obviousness still stands because the argument amounts to mere allegation without convincing evidence so as to render the reasons proffered in the rejection inappropriate.

35 USC § 102 Rejection:

(B) Applicants have submitted that Beauchamp's standard screens in the Universal client is limited to such standard screens hence cannot be used with 'any appropriate interface' (Appl. Rmrks pg. 17, top) as required in claim 4. The universality of Beauchamp's framework is conveyed not just by the fact that the interface framework is called 'Universal client' but more because the framework can be applied to any business aspects of the client's desired process reutilizing persisted metadata or OO resources. The 'any application interface' limitation, for the sake of argument, can be perceived indirectly via such teaching by the claim language such as:

generating interface or language; modifying and building of a customizable model, or user interface based on some retrieval of repository source metadata. The claim language has been given weight to the very extent at which the above specific features or language have been interpreted. Thus, this 'any application interface' or 'independent of the type of application' limitation --in terms of how it should be construed-- has been given merits based upon such interpretation; and from such vantage point, Beauchamp's reusable repository of object sources and assets for effectuating any client's desired build on the fly of a process is deemed sufficient to meet the above 'any application interface' because in whole, the language of the claimed steps does not stringently preclude Beauchamp's approach from fulfilling this capacity as being applicable to 'any' UI instance of one or more user's building of a process. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

(C) Applicants have submitted that Helgeson fails to remedy to the deficiency of Beauchamp (Appl. Rmrks, pg. 17-18). This allegation against Helgeson is treated not sufficiently establishing a prima facie rationale of response in order to reverse how the teachings as combined cannot fulfill the desired effect intended by the rationale set forth in the Office Action. Notwithstanding the observations made in section B in regard to Beauchamp's fulfilling the language of claim 4, and in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The rest of the claims rejection are necessitated by the amendments; and in light of the above, the claims still stand rejected as set forth above.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan A Vu
Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2193
October 04, 2007